

III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended herein; and, claim 3 is cancelled. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is requested.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,970,918), hereinafter “Brown”. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brown as applied to claim 1, and in view of admitted prior art.

A. Rejection of claim 5 under 112, second paragraph

Regarding the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, Applicants have amended claim 5 to include the phrase “means for”. Accordingly, Applicants request a withdrawal of the rejection.

B. Rejections of claim 1, 3 and 4 under 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown

Applicants traverse the rejections for the following reasons. Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable over the cited art because the cited art does not teach all of the claim features, as is required under 102(e). Applicants contend that at least two limitations in claim 1 are not taught in the cited art.

First, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to teach, *inter alia*, “said proxy receiving said response over the Internet network and storing said response in a user context database and **transmitting said response to said user over the Internet network** after said cookie has been removed from said response, so that said **user can send all subsequent requests** for accessing said Internet resources contained in said content server **to said proxy over the Internet network.**” Emphasis added. See claim 1.

The cited art, Brown, discloses a configuration wherein any communication between its client device 10 and proxy machine 11 is not via/through the Internet 14. For example, Figures 2a, 2b, and 3 clearly show the Internet (element 14 in figs. 2a, 2b) and Internet servers (element 30 in fig. 3) not being configured between the alleged proxy (element 11) and the alleged user (element 10). The specification of Brown further supports this configuration where communication between the client device 10 and proxy machine 11 is via a local-area network (LAN) or wide-area network (WAN). See e.g., col. 3, lines 55-60. “Proxy machine 11 acts as a web server and/or browser that is intermediate to client device 10 and Internet server 30.” Col. 4, lines 8-10.

Contrastingly, figure 1 in the instant application depicts a configuration that clearly shows communication between user 10, content server 14, and proxy 16, all via the Internet 12. There is no teaching or suggestion in Brown of communication between the user and proxy over the Internet network as in the claimed invention.

Second, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to teach, *inter alia*, wherein said cookie which has been stored in said user context database is added to all subsequent requests **from said user** for accessing Internet resources in said content server. Emphasis added. See claim 1.

The aforementioned feature was previously found in dependent claim 3. As such, Applicants refer to the rejection of claim 3. In rejecting claim 3, the Office alleges that the aforementioned feature is disclosed in Brown at column 5, lines 17-27. Office Action, item 8, page 4. Applicants point that the cited portion of the specification ends with a conflicting configuration. “As illustrated in block 50, the retrieved, unexpired cookies are then placed into the HTTP(S) request header so they may be transmitted to the content server 16 **when the requests is made by proxy machine 11.**” Column 5, lines 23-27. Contrastingly, the claimed invention entails, *inter alia*, cookies being added to subsequent requests of the user, not by the proxy.

In sum, Brown does not teach or suggest all of the features found in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 1.

With respect to dependent claims 2, 4 and 5, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 10, 2007

/Joseph J. Christian/

Joseph J. Christian
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044